



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,931	12/21/2001	Thomas N. Turba	RA 5410 (33012/328/101)	2573
27516	7590	01/04/2005	EXAMINER	
UNISYS CORPORATION			WU, YICUN	
MS 4773			ART UNIT	
PO BOX 64942			PAPER NUMBER	
ST. PAUL, MN 55164-0942			2165	

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/027,931

Applicant(s)

TURBA ET AL.

Examiner

Yicun Wu

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2165

III. DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-25 are presented for examination.
2. Applicant's arguments submitted on 6-21-2004 with respect to claims 1-25 have been reconsidered but are not deemed persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

Response to Applicant' Remarks

3. Examiner has completed a through study of Applicant's amendment of June 21, 2004.
4. Especially, Applicant's amendments to claims 1-25 and remarks at pages 10-13 of the Amendment of 6-21-2004 has been carefully studied and reviewed.
5. Applicant's amendments to claims 1-25 further direct the claimed invention into in a data processing system including a legacy data base management system which executes a command language coupled to a publically accessible digital data communication network.
6. Examiner has carefully and thoroughly studied and reviewed Applicant's amendment of 6-21-2004. Examiner asserts that Chau

Art Unit: 2165

et al (U. S. Patent No. 6,643,633) in combination with Walsh et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,810,429) teaches Applicant's claimed invention of in a data processing system including a legacy data base management system which executes a command language coupled to a publically accessible digital data communication network.

In addition, the specially discussed feature of the claimed invention ("a service request contained within a document formatted in XML and converts the service request into the command language for execution") is very clearly discussed in Walsh et al. (col. 5, lines 62-65 and fig. 3).

7. Applicant is inaccurate for the reasons explicitly stated in the first Office Action. Examiner asserts that teaches Applicant's claimed invention of in a data processing system including a legacy data base management system which executes a command language coupled to a publically accessible digital data communication network.

8. These reasons have been explicitly stated in the first Office Action. Please see the next section.

Art Unit: 2165

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chau et al (U. S. Patent No. 6,643,633) in view of Walsh et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,810,429).

As to Claim 1, Chau et al. discloses As to Claims 1, Chau et al discloses in a data processing system including a legacy data base management system which executes a command language coupled to a publically accessible digital data communication network, the improvement comprising:

a document formatted in XML (extensible markup language) transferred via the publically accessible digital data communication network to the data base management system (Fig. 2); and

Art Unit: 2165

an Input Definition Table (IDT) responsively coupled to the legacy data base management system which by the legacy data base management system (Fig. 9-11 and col. 77, lines 22-67).

Chau et al does not teach a service request contained within a document formatted in XML and converts the service request into the command language for execution.

Walsh et al. teaches a service request (col. 5, lines 62-65) contained within a document formatted in XML (fig. 3, item 102) and converts the service request into the command language for execution (col. 5, lines 62-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chau et al. with a service request contained within a document formatted in XML and converts the service request into the command language for execution.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chau et al. by the teaching of Walsh et al. because providing a service request contained within a document formatted in XML and converts the service request into the command language for execution allows a uniform user interface to the database as taught by Walsh et al. (col. 2, lines 56-67).

Art Unit: 2165

As to Claims 2, 7, 12 and 17, Chau et al. as modified teaches a improvement further comprising

a Document Type Definition (DTD) which defines the format of the document (Chau et al. col. 9, lines 12-20).

As to Claims 3, 8, 13 and 18, Chau et al as modified teaches a improvement wherein

the IDT further comprises a plurality of sequential text lines (Chau et al col. 79, line 1- col. 80, line 67).

As to Claims 4, 9, 14 and 19 Chau et al as modified teaches a improvement wherein

at least one of the plurality of sequential text lines provides access constraints (Chau et al col. 79, line 1- col. 80, line 67).

As to Claims 5, 10, 15 and 20, Chau et al as modified teaches a improvement further comprising

a repository responsively coupled to the legacy data base management system wherein the IDT is Chau et al Fig. 9-11 and col. 77, lines 22-67).

Art Unit: 2165

As to Claim 6, Chau et al as modified teaches an apparatus comprising:

a. an XML document containing a service request (Walsh et al. col. 5, lines 62-65 and fig. 3, item 102);

b. a publically accessible digital data communication network (Chau et al Fig. 2);

c. a data base management system having an input format different from XML which honors the service request by executing a sequence of command language statements (Walsh et al. col. 5, lines 62-65 and fig. 3, item 102)

responsively coupled to the publically accessible digital data communication network which receives the XML document via the publically accessible digital data communication network (Chau et al Fig. 2); and

d. an Input Definition Table associated with the XML document which enables conversion of the XML document into the sequence of command language statements (Chau et al. Fig. 9-11 and col. 77, lines 22-67).

As to Claim 11, Chau et al as modified teaches a method of honoring a service request contained within an XML document by a data base management system by executing a sequence of command

Art Unit: 2165

language script which having an incompatible input protocol comprising:

a. transferring the XML document to the data base management system via a publically accessible digital data communication network (Chau et al. Fig. 2);

b. converting the XML document into an XML mapping tree in accordance with a Document Type Definition (DTD) corresponding to the XML document (i.e. DTD. Chau et al. col. 9, lines 12-20);

c. converting the service request contained within the XML document into the sequence of command language script using an Input Definition Table (IDT) (Chau et al. Fig. 9-11 and col. 77, lines 22-67); and

d. executing the sequence of command language script by the data base management system for processing (Walsh et al. col. 5, lines 62-65 and fig. 3, item 102).

As to Claim 16, Chau et al as modified teaches an apparatus comprising:

a. transmitting means for transmitting an XML document containing a service request for execution of data base management functions (Chau et al. Fig. 2);

Art Unit: 2165 .

b. stating means for stating a IDT associated-with the document (Chau et al. Fig. 9-11 and col. 77, lines 22-67);

c. providing means responsively coupled to the transmitting means for providing data base management functions executing a sequence of command language statements (Walsh et al. col. 5, lines 62-65 and fig. 3, item 102); and

d. converting means responsively coupled to the providing means for converting the XML document into the sequence of command language statements (Walsh et al. col. 5, lines 62-65 and fig. 3, item 102) for execution by the providing means based upon the IDT (Chau et al. Fig. 9-11 and col. 77, lines 22-67).

As to Claim 21, Chau et al as modified teaches a method of coupling an XML message to a data base management system having an incompatible format comprising:

a. retrieving an existing XML element to source tree from a repository (Chau et al Fig. 2);

b. modifying the existing XML element to source tree in accordance with the XML message (Chau et al. Fig. 9-11 and col. 77, lines 22-67); and

c. using the XML element to source tree for converting the XML message to the incompatible format (Chau et al. Fig. 9-11 and col. 77, lines 22-67).

Art Unit: 2165

As to Claim 22, Chau et al as modified teaches a method wherein

the XML element to source tree further comprises a plurality of elements and a plurality of attributes (Chau et al. Fig. 9-11 and col. 77, lines 22-67).

As to Claim 23, Chau et al as modified teaches a method wherein

the modifying step further comprises deleting one of the plurality of attributes (Chau et al. Fig. 9-11 and col. 77, lines 22-67).

As to Claim 24, Chau et al as modified teaches a method wherein

the modifying step further comprises adding a new attribute to the plurality of attributes (Chau et al. Fig. 9-11 and col. 77, lines 22-67).

As to Claim 25, Chau et al as modified teaches a method wherein

Art Unit: 2165

the modifying step further comprises deleting one of the plurality of elements (Chau et al. Fig. 9-11 and col. 77, lines 22-67) .

Conclusion

11. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, *THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL*. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory- period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply-expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2165

Points of contact


12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yicun Wu whose telephone number is 571-272-4087. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 4:30 pm, Monday -Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 571-272-4083. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Yicun Wu
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

December 13, 2004


CHARLES RONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER